REMARKS:

After entry of this amendment, claims 1 to 14 and 16 to 34 will be pending, with claims 17 to 20 withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-14, and 16 have been amended herein to more clearly define the invention in these claims over the cited art.

The Rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 7-16,21, and 26-34 are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Diwan (US6,801,936) in view of Sahai et al (US6,594,699) (hereafter Sahai).

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The invention is directed to the creation of alternate versions of structured markup language documents such as HTML or XML internet documents suitable for the limited display, e.g. small screen size and related resources, e.g. bandwidth limitations of internet appliances i.e. mobile telephones, personal digital assistants (PDAs). To this end, the present claimed invention provides a unique method and system for the provision of such alternate versions of structured markup language documents and the selective

12

delivery of such documents to these internet appliances.

The combined Diwan and Sahai references do, in a very general way, recognize that data delivered to a network user client should be selectively formatted to the needs of a client user. These references disclose very little else with respect to the present claimed invention. The references do not relate to structured markup language documents, e.g XML Web pages. The references do not suggest a method or system for the creation of alternate versions of original markup language documents. The combined references do not provide for enabling the user client to select, via a menu, to have the alternate version of an original markup language document delivered to the client.

The following independent claims 1 and 21 are presented with underlining to indicate all of the elements of the present invention which are lacking in the individual or combined teaching of Diwan and Sahai.

    1. A method for customizing a structured markup language document and delivering said customized structured markup language document to an internet appliance, comprising:
    identifying information units in <u>an original structured markup language document</u>;
    selecting one or more of said information units for delivery;
    <u>creating</u> in a database <u>a second structured markup language document</u> including said one or more of said information units, <u>said second structured markup language</u>

document customized according to capabilities of and for delivery to said internet appliance;

delivering to said internet appliance a menu for selection of at least said second structured markup language document, said menu including as a selection item at least a bookmark representing said second structured markup language document; and

delivering said second structured markup language document to said internet appliance.

The basic Diwan patent does not relate to the selection of items in markup language i.e. Web documents/pages. The Diwan system does not process markup language documents; it is concerned with continuous broadcasting and multicasting of a variety of internet broadcast information streams, e.g. news, sports, science, financial from which the Diwan method selects the information items of interest to the client/user and delivers the broadcast bundled stream to the client user.

Diwan does not create a second customized alternate markup language document. Even with Diwan's bundled multicasts, there is no alternate or second version. There is only an initial bundle based on user interests.

There is nothing in Diwan resembling a menu from which the user may select to have a second or alternate structured markup language document delivered.

There is <u>no mention</u> of bookmarks in Diwan, let alone a <u>bookmark representing the address of an alternate version of a structured markup language document in a menu</u>.

<u>Sahai</u> does make up for any of these deficiencies of Diwan. Sahai does teach that a multimedia data stream may be customized to the needs of a receiving client with limited data stream handling resources. Otherwise all of the above elements of the present invention lacking in Diwan are not found in Sahai. The reference is not concerned with markup language documents, or alternate versions of such documents, or menus having bookmarks representative of such alternate versions selectable by a user client.

Now, please consider claim 21 presented as follows.

21. A document customization system, comprising:
a management server offering a document customization service to a user;
a document manager associated with said management server for performing said <u>document customization service to web pages identified by said user</u>, said document customization service customizing said web pages according to capabilities of and for delivery to an internet appliance, said document customization service <u>identifying information units in said web pages</u> and enabling the user to select one or more of said information units for delivery to the user;
a database accessible by said document manager, said database <u>storing customized web pages resulting from</u> said document manager performing said document customization service; and

a portal for <u>accessing said customized web pages in said database via bookmarks representing at least said customized web pages.</u>

<u>Diwan does not customize web pages</u> which are identified i.e. chosen by the user to be customized.

<u>Diwan does not store these customized web pages.</u>

<u>Diwan does not</u> disclose <u>accessing such stored web pages via bookmarks</u> representing the stored pages.

Here again, <u>Sahai</u> does make up for any of these deficiencies of Diwan. Sahai does not teach: customizing Web page identified i.e. chosen by users; storing such customized web pages; or accessing such stored web pages via bookmarks representing the stored pages.

Claim 2 is rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Diwan (US6,801,936) in view of Sahai et al (US6,594,699), further in view of Katariya (US2002/0091789)

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 is specific to one type of structured markup language document, an XML document. Katariya discloses that XML documents are known in the art. Applicants concede this but submit that claim 2 is patentable for all of the reasons set forth

hereinabove for the patentability of claim 1 from which claim 2 depends.

Claims 4-6, and 23-25, are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Diwan (US6,801,936) in view of Sahai et al (US6,594,699), further in view of Fienleib (US6,272,532)

This rejection is respectfully traversed. These claims cover specific internet appliances for which the alternate structured markup language documents may be customized. Fienlieb discloses that such internet appliances are known.

Applicants concede this but submit that claims 4-6, and 23-25 are patentable for all of the reasons set forth hereinabove for the patentability of claims 1 and 21 from these claims respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, this Application, including claims 1-14, 16, and 21-34, is submitted to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this Application.

To discuss any matter pertaining to the present Application, Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 947-0700.

Respectfully submitted

Dated: August 27, 2007

Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Swernofsky Law Group
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700